10:Hasluck F-5 (1926-1939)1954 EGl Albania EGl

417 and if properly placed to begin with, caused no trouble. The same
685 was true of living hedges inland. On the other hand, living hedges in the marshy areas near the mouth of the river Mat sometimes
[241] grew so tall that they damaged the neighbouring land with their shade. To prevent this, the owner had to lop overgrown trees once every three years. Failing this, his neighbour could complain to the headman; inevitably they gave him leave to cut the trees down to the root on the owner's ground, an intrusion that was in itself a punishment, and fined the owner 250–450 grosh for breaking the law about lopping.

423 Similar rules regulated the planting of fruit and other trees, olives
245 being included among the former. In Mirditë a fruit tree might be planted only 5 'feet' (1 metre) from the boundary; another kind had to be at least 10 feet away. In Godolesh, a great fruit-growing area, a fruit tree could be planted on the very boundary, but in adjacent Labinot it had to be a span away. In Shkrel it could be planted anywhere on one's own ground, as it never caused trouble
[685] by itself. As with living hedges, care had to be taken that a tree did not cast harmful shade over a neighbour's land. If one did so in Shkrel the owner agreed amicably to lop it, raising no objections unless he had already quarrelled with his neighbour over something else. In Mirditë he was bound to lop the offending branches; if he failed to do so his neighbour could lop them as high as he could reach with a hook, the handle of which did not exceed 3½ spans in length. In the mountains of Lesh the owner had to uproot the tree or to pay annual damages to his neighbour. In Godolesh the neighbour was entitled to stretch as far as he could and cut the too luxuriant branches with his short-handled axe. If a tree was doing no damage to neighbouring ground, it could not be lopped except by its owner. A man who transgressed this law in Mirditë had to pay its owner 500 grosh.

312 Sometimes an open drain adjoined a boundary. When it was
423 first cut, each of the two neighbours provided half the ground
476 required, did half the work and retained the earth excavated from his own side. Three stones, one big and two small, were left at the head to mark the boundary; the two other sets, normally placed in the middle and at the foot, were removed to make room for the water; as the drain discharged into a bigger channel, they could not possibly be left at the foot. The boundary naturally ran exactly down the middle. In most places the drain had to be cleared out

10: Hasluck F-5 (1926-1939)1954 EGI Albania EGI

annually. In Godolesh the two neighbours did it in alternate years, having exclusive right to the earth with its valuable fertilizing properties for the year when they did the clean up. In Lumë two neighbours cleared the drain together year after year and flung half the earth on one side and half on the other.

In other places one ditch seldom drained two neighbouring fields on the principle that 'you can't walk on my path or use my drain'. In Gurrëzë the man who wanted a drain had to cut it on his own ground with a 'footprint' (20 cm.) of land between the boundary and its edge for the protection of his neighbour's land. Without this buttress the drain might overflow or burst its bank to the detriment of his neighbour. In either contingency its owner had to pay compensation to his neighbour, but prevention of damage was always better for both parties. His neighbour might also accuse him of encroaching on his land, an insulting remark that provoked instant retaliation. If, later on, the neighbour wanted a drain he had to make one for himself, also a 'footprint' away from the boundary. In Lumë and Elbasan there was little risk that open drains would flood, but there too a space had to be left between their edge and the boundary. The avowed purpose of this space was to support the boundary stones. In all cases of single ownership the owner, on clearing the ditch, threw the earth on his own side, where it testified to his ownership if this was ever questioned.

Sometimes a man of Shkrel wanted both a drain and a fence. In that event the ditch was cut along the boundary and a strip of ground of the same width was set aside on the other side of the boundary. All the earth excavated from the ditch was thrown on this strip and so the neighbours became quits, one had a 'hole' on his land and the other a 'hill'. The fence was erected on the 'hill'.

We come now to one of the most important considerations in boundary making. North Albania is one of the wettest regions in Europe, and when the land was waterlogged it inevitably tended to slip downhill. The tropical intensity of many rainstorms increased the mischief. Terracing the fields would have helped to check it, but such manual labour is contrary to the habits and dignity of the north Albanian. His law, however, gave him every possible protection. When there were two fields on a slope, one above the other, they might be separated by a field-path, a road, an irrigation channel or a fence. (The term 'field-path' includes the

10:Hasluck F-5 (1926-1939)1954 EGl Albania EGl

the loopholes. A still richer man, or one with many enemies, had several doors in his courtyard wall and watch-towers at strategic points. (The turrets at each corner and in the middle of the long walls effectually commanded these entrances, and many loopholes in the walls provided space for many defenders to shoot from.) Shevqet Bey Verlaci of Elbasan had several posterns in his garden wall, each commanded by a watch-tower and each providing him in case of need with a possible means of escape.

Incidentally, back entrances in the mountains were useful for guests with enemies. These could enter unseen by other guests, among whom there might be one or more who would inform the enemy of his whereabouts, and so endanger his life. They were also useful if the master had sent a group of his followers to shoot his enemy; if they failed, they could creep in unseen by the guests; in case of failure on such an errand, they did not wish the attempt to be known.

A wanted man who wished to work in his fields might station a child herding goats or a woman minding a cow at a vantage point where an enemy could be detected and the watcher give him warning, so that he might seize his rifle and defend himself. As the enemy's trump card was surprise, he was likely to retreat when detected. Before the wanted man left the house the women and children would look through the windows to make sure no enemy was near. A man with blood on his hands might wish to go to the forest to cut firewood, a place too distant for his women to keep watch. In that case he might send a scout ahead to reconnoitre the road, and himself follow rifle in hand. In Zdrâjshë, Çermenikë, the communal hay-field was so far away that a wanted man made no attempt to go and cut his hay; the others, however, gave him his due share, though he had done nothing to earn it. A man who, in spite of risks, kept moving about might never stir outside, especially at night, without his rifle. He never told where he was going and travelled by an unlikely route and at unwonted times.

In the summer of 1935, to return from Tirana, whither he had been officially summoned, Murat Kaloshi of Dibër sent out an attendant to find a car willing to drive at once to Dibër, and within five minutes of its drawing up at the door of his lodging started. This was at 2 p.m., an hour when Tirana is plunged in sleep on a summer afternoon. He supped at the wayside inn of Lunik, an insignificant village without telegraphic communication, four or